# BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA

## **DOCKET NO. 2018-319-E**

In the Matter of:	)	
	)	REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF
Application of Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC	)	LESLEY QUICK
for Adjustments in Electric Rate Schedules	)	FOR DUKE ENERGY
and Tariffs and Request for Accounting Order	)	CAROLINAS, LLC

#### I. INTRODUCTION

	<b>Q.</b>	PLEASE STATE	YOUR NAME	, BUSINESS	<b>ADDRESS AND</b>	<b>CURRENT</b>
--	-----------	--------------	-----------	------------	--------------------	----------------

- POSITION.
- 3 A. My name is Lesley Quick, and my business address is 400 South Tryon Street,
- 4 Charlotte, North Carolina. I am employed by Duke Energy Corporation ("Duke
- 5 Energy") as Vice President, Revenue Services.

## 6 Q. WHAT ARE YOUR PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES AS VICE

## 7 PRESIDENT, REVENUE SERVICES?

- 8 A. I am responsible for developing the strategy, operational plans, business controls
- 9 and workforce strategy for the Company's billing operations, payment processing
- across multiple channels and credit and collection processes for approximately 8
- million retail electric and gas customers across six jurisdictions. I am also
- responsible for the customer experience across these operations and ensuring
- appropriate compliance with regulatory guidelines and policies throughout the
- critical billing, revenue and payment streams.

## 15 Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND

#### 16 **PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.**

- 17 A. I obtained a Bachelor's degree in Financial Management from Clemson
- University in 2002. I started with the Company two weeks after graduation and
- have remained an employee for the past 17 years. Since 2002, I have worked for
- the Company in a variety of roles, each with increasing responsibility, in Finance,
- 21 Rates and Regulatory Compliance, Corporate Strategy and Customer Solutions

- products and services. I assumed my current position in Customer Services in 2017.
- 3 Q. DID YOU PREVIOUSLY FILE DIRECT TESTIMONY IN THIS
  4 PROCEEDING?
- 5 A. No, I did not.

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

A.

## II. <u>PURPOSE AND SCOPE</u>

#### 7 Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?

The purpose of my rebuttal testimony is to respond to: (1) the South Carolina Office of the Regulatory Staff (the "ORS") witness Gaby Smith's recommendation to not include the Company's growth projections in the Company's proposed adjustment for credit, debit and Automated Clearing House ("ACH") payment (collectively, "credit card") expenses; and (2) the South Carolina State Conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the South Carolina Coastal Conservation League and Upstate Forever (collectively, "SC NAACP/CCL/UF") witness John Howat's requests for DE Carolinas to publicly file with the Commission monthly data regarding general residential and low-income customer accounts, billing, receipts, arrearages, notices of disconnections, bill payment agreements, disconnections of service for nonpayment, reconnections of service after disconnection for nonpayment, accounts written off as uncollectible, and accounts sent to collection agencies.

## III. RESPONSE TO ORS WITNESS SMITH

- 2 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE ORS WITNESS SMITH'S RECOMMENDATION
- 3 REGARDING THE COMPANY'S ADJUSTMENT FOR CREDIT CARD
- 4 **FEE EXPENSES.**

1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- 5 A. ORS witness Smith does not object to the Company's proposal to allow
- residential customers to use their credit cards to pay their electric bill without
- being charged a convenience fee by allowing the Company to recover the costs of
- 8 credit card fee expenses through the Company's cost of service. Witness Smith
- 9 recommends the exclusion of the Company's growth projections in its calculation
- of credit card fee expenses by arguing that the growth projections are not known
- and measurable.

## Q. DO YOU AGREE WITH WITNESS SMITH'S RECOMMENDATION?

A. No. The purpose of the Company's proposal is to enable residential customers to make payments through several methods without incurring a transaction fee. The requirement to pay a transaction fee when making a payment is one of the largest frustrations customers experience when paying their utility bill. Customer complaints over these additional fees stem from the fact that these fees are already accounted for in the retail price of virtually all other products that consumers purchase every day. For example, in the Company's 2018 Monthly Residential Transaction Surveys, residential customers noted the following when asked what

"Not charge a fee for using a credit card."

they liked least about their billing and payment experience:

"Take away the service charge.	I just don't understand why you want to
charge somebody \$1.50."	

"The only thing that I can say is I think they want to penalize you. If you want to pay a certain way, they charge you extra."

As customer expectations change and more payments are done electronically, utility companies are beginning to offer fee-free payment programs for their residential customers for all methods of payment.<sup>1</sup> Additionally, consumer advocate groups have suggested that convenience fees for paying utility bills can be burdensome to customers.<sup>2</sup>

Accordingly, industry research shows that by eliminating the requirement for residential customers to pay a credit card fee every time they make a payment, the Company will experience a significant, year over year, increase in the usage of credit cards (i.e., the growth or take rate) to pay their electric bills. As such, unless the Company's cost of service can be adjusted to reflect a reasonable level of growth associated with the increase in usage, the amount reflected in rates will be significantly less than the Company's cost to administer the service for residential customers. Further, the distance between the amount reflected in the rates and the costs to provide this service to residential customers will continue to

According to J.D. Power and Associates, as of 2016, about 28 percent of surveyed electric utilities provide a fee-free card payment option. *See* J.D. Power Catalog. J.D. Power and Associates, 2016 Electric Utility Residential Customer Satisfaction Study.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Nat'l Ass'n of State Util. Consumer Advocates, *Urging Utilities to Eliminate "Convenience" Fees for Paying Utility Bills with Debit and Credit Cards and Urging Appropriate State Regulatory Oversight* (Nov. 13, 2012), *available at* https://nasuca.org/2012-07-urging-utilities-to-eliminate-convenience-fees-for-paying-utility-bills-withdebit-and-credit-cards-and-urging-appropriate-state-regulatory-oversight/.

grow over time. To prevent this, the Company believes it is appropriate to maintain its estimated growth projection in its proposed adjustment.

# Q. DOES THE COMPANY'S ADJUSTMENT INCLUDE A REASONABLE PROJECTION FOR GROWTH?

A. Yes. The Company derived its growth projections from historical and current payment transaction data beginning in 2014. Specifically, Duke Energy extracted transaction volume detail from its Customer Information System ("CIS") applications across the Carolinas, from 2014 through 2017, and recorded year over year average growth in credit card transactions over the past several years.

Year	DEC Transactions	% Increase	Year	DEP Transactions	% Increase		Year	DEP and DEC Combined Transactions	% Increase	
2014	4,683,008		2014	1,972,629			2014	6,655,637		
2015	5,148,767	10%	2015	2,282,542	16%		2015	7,431,309	12%	
2016	5,563,216	8%	2016	2,520,137	10%		2016	8,083,353	9%	
2017	6,055,070	9%	2017	2,824,130	12%		2017	8,879,200	10%	
		9% [	1]1		13%	[1]			10%	[1]

#### [1] – Average historic year over year growth

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

The Company then benchmarked its growth projections against industry data. The Company's industry research supports higher growth in this channel once customers are no longer being charged transaction fees. For example, Fisery, an industry leader in payment card processing, conducted transactional research comparing free bill payment methods to fee-based bill payment methods. According to their analysis, companies that offered free bill payment methods experienced at least double the year over year increase in the number of credit card transactions than those who offered fee-based bill payment methods. The Company also reviewed recent fee free credit card proposals filed by utilities

around the country and found that the projected increase in credit card transactions cited by utilities ranged anywhere from 5 to 30 percent. Further, the Company benchmarked against a similarly-situated electric utility that offers feefree credit card usage. The results of the benchmarking showed that the increase in annual credit card payments doubled in the channel in the first year and have shown steady growth, year over year.

Based on historical data and industry research, the Company is therefore projecting the increase in the annual credit card payment post-deployment to double in the first year. Specifically, because the Company's current level of credit card payments continues to increase approximately 10 percent per year, the Company is projecting an additional 10 percent increase (i.e., double the increase from the prior year) in credit card activity once the program is implemented, for a total increase of 20 percent. For the reasons stated above, the Company's growth projection is reasonable and should be reflected in the adjustment. Otherwise, the Company will be penalized for implementing a program designed to improve our customers' satisfaction with their payment experience.

Q.	IF THE COMMISSION DETERMINES THAT INCLUDING THE
	GROWTH PROJECTION IN THE ADJUSTMENT IS NOT
	APPROPRIATE, ARE THERE ALTERNATIVES AVAILABLE THAT
	WILL ENABLE THE COMPANY TO STILL ADMINISTER THE
	PROGRAM?
A.	Yes. While the Company believes incorporating the growth projection in the
	credit card fee adjustment is the best method to ensure the Company is collecting
	an amount reflective of the increase in credit card usage, an alternative option is
	to allow the Company to establish a deferral for the credit card fee expenses the
	Company will incur that are incremental to the amount reflected in rates.
	IV. RESPONSE TO WITNESS HOWAT
Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE WITNESS HOWAT'S RECOMMENDATIONS
	REGARDING THE COLLECTING AND REPORTING OF CUSTOMER-
	RELATED INFORMATION.
Α.	Witness Howat recommends the Commission require DE Carolinas to prepare,
	file with the Commission, and make available to the public monthly, detailed
	customer data for residential customers and low-income customers. He cites

numerous data points including, by zip code: billing, receipts, arrearages, notices

of disconnection, bill payment agreements, disconnections of service for

nonpayment, reconnections of service after disconnection for non-payment,

accounts written off as uncollectible and accounts sent to collection agencies.

## Q. DO YOU AGREE WITH WITNESS HOWAT'S RECOMMENDATION?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

A.

No. First, the Company already provides a significant level of detail pertaining to non-pay service disconnects. Pursuant to Docket No. 2006-193-EG, the Company, along with all other investor-owned utilities ("IOUs") in South Carolina, files quarterly reports on voluntary and involuntary disconnections of service.<sup>3</sup> The quarterly reports include the following data and information: (1) total number of accounts whose services have been voluntarily or involuntarily disconnected; (2) the reason for the disconnection; (3) the average duration of service interruption; and (4) the Company procedures in effect governing delinquent account disconnections. The Company believes the data contained in these reports provides the Commission with sufficient information about the Company's disconnection policies, procedures and number of accounts affected. Further, since the IOUs uniformly report on non-pay service disconnects per Docket No. 2006-193-EG, any change in reporting obligations for DE Carolinas would likely cause a ripple effect across all IOUs in South Carolina. Accordingly, this proceeding is not the appropriate forum to fully evaluate the impact of witness Howat's recommendations.

Additionally, the Company does not currently track the information requested by witness Howat by zip code in the normal course of its business. Currently, any attempt to provide the requested data by zip code would require the Company to perform a series of ad hoc queries on the Company's systems to

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Quarterly Reports on Involuntary Termination of Electric and/or Gas Service, Docket. No. 2006-193-EG (July 2006).

extract the data, it ultimately does not need to provide service and ordinarily would not track, without a clear way to verify its accuracy.

## Q. DOES THE COMPANY COLLECT DATA NOW THAT COULD BE USED

#### 4 TO IDENTIFY CUSTOMERS AS "LOW-INCOME"?

3

16

17

18

19

20

No. The Company cannot readily distinguish customers by income or any socio-5 economic indicators in the normal course of its business. Further, Witness Howat 6 refers to "low-income customers" in this context as a customer identified as a 7 participant receiving assistance from the Low Income Home Energy Assistance 8 Program ("LIHEAP"). However, the South Carolina LIHEAP is not required to 9 provide this information to the Company as a prerequisite for a customer to 10 participate in the program. As such, the Company does not receive or track data 11 in such a way that it can readily provide the requested data points by LIHEAP 12 account. 13

# 14 Q. DOES THE COMPANY HAVE PRIVACY CONCERNS REGARDING 15 THIS RECOMMENDATION?

A. Yes. The Company handles customer information with the utmost sensitivity and confidentiality. While in the aggregate, witness Howat is requesting detailed, customer-related information broken down by both socioeconomic status and zip code. Having this level of detail readily available to third parties may cause some customers to be concerned with how the data could be used.

## 1 Q. DOES THE COMPANY HAVE ANY OTHER CONCERNS WITH

### 2 SHARING THIS INFORMATION AS WITNESS HOWAT

#### 3 **RECOMMENDS?**

- Witness Howat asserts this information is needed to assess: (1) the A. 4 effectiveness of existing regulatory consumer protections and credit and collection 5 practices; (2) the state of home energy security among DE Carolinas' residential 6 customers, and to evaluate the effectiveness of programs and policies intended to 7 protect that security; and (3) the effectiveness of the credit and collection policies 8 and practices of the Company. However, the Company remains unclear on 9 whether and how the requested data points would be used in such an assessment 10 in South Carolina, or how "effectiveness" would be defined as a metric. 11
- 12 Q. MR. HOWAT STATES IN HIS TESTIMONY THAT THE REQUESTED
  13 MONTHLY DATA IS COLLECTED AND REPORTED ON IN OHIO. ARE
  14 THERE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN OHIO AND SOUTH CAROLINA
  15 THAT THE COMMISSION SHOULD BE MADE AWARE?
- Yes. Mr. Howat is referring to the State of Ohio's Percentage of Income Payment 16 A. 17 Plan ("PIPP") program, a state-mandated program allowing low-income households to pay a percentage of their household income instead of their actual 18 19 bill. The State of Ohio requires all regulated gas and electric companies, 20 including Duke Energy Ohio, to participate and the Ohio Development Services 21 Agency (ODSA) governs PIPP for electric customers in Ohio. To be eligible for 22 PIPP, customers must first apply for all energy assistance programs for which they

are eligible. Applications for PIPP are then managed through a community action agency, who verifies the customer's eligibility, including income level, on an annual basis. As such, the community action agent is responsible for collecting income-level data and handling reporting obligations to the state associated with the program.

## VII. <u>CONCLUSION</u>

## 7 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?

8 A. Yes.